

EXHIBIT 32



Office of the State's Attorney for Baltimore City

120 East Baltimore Street

Baltimore, MD 21202

Marilyn J. Mosby

State's Attorney for Baltimore City

CONVICTION INTEGRITY UNIT REPORT

By: Lauren R. Lipscomb

Chief, Conviction Integrity Unit

November 13, 2019

State v. Alfred Chestnut 18335414-15

State v. Ransom Watkins 18335416-17

State v. Andrew Stewart 18335418-19

In September 2019, the CIP Team interviewed Student #3⁴⁵. They advised there were only boys, no girls, in the C/D Hallway when the incident occurred.

Our belief is that Student #4 and friends were either cutting class or had snuck out of class early and did not see the murder, but observed parts of the period leading up to the incident and following the incident. As the 3 Defendants were in fact at the school, Student #4 likely did see them at some point. Indeed, the math teacher testified to seeing the 3 Defendants in math class⁴⁶ at around 12:30pm. She testified that Watkins walked into the back of her classroom. She said she told Watkins to leave, then went out into the hallway finding Chestnut and Stewart there. She told all 3 to leave and continued to the stairwell area, grabbing the unit principal who was heading up the stairwell. She directed the principal toward the direction of the 3 Defendants who had run down the C/D hallway. She testified that she returned to her classroom to resume teaching at around 12:40pm. It is entirely probable that Student #4 et al. left class during the commotion.

Recantation

Student #4 was interviewed present day by the CIP team. They advised that, while they remembered testifying at trial, they do not remember "what was said back then". They further do not remember being shown pictures or picking anybody out. Student #4 provided that she/he was in school on 11/18/83. While in school, he/she saw three boys talking to the Victim. She/he knew one guy talking to the Victim. She/he did not hear a gunshot and did not see anybody shoot a gun. She/he did

⁴⁵ Student #3's interview is detailed later.

⁴⁶ This is the math class that Student #4, Individual C and Individual D were in.

not see the Victim in a struggle and did not see the murder. She/he did not know the Defendants on trial⁴⁷.

Following the murder, Student #4 remembers seeing the Victim come into the cafeteria by himself. She/he remembers that "chaos and confusion" ensued. She/he did not know the Victim had been shot until she/he saw him in the cafeteria. Student #4 and friends were already seated in the cafeteria when the Victim came in⁴⁸.

Student #4 knows Student #3. Student #4 remembers seeing Student #3 seated in the cafeteria as well -- ahead of the Victim coming in.

In reflecting on the pre-trial period, Student #4 remembers attending so many meetings, she/he did not know "who was who".

2. Student #1 (16Y⁴⁹)

Discrepancies

- a. Pre-Trial Investigation. On 11/18/83, Student #1 was interviewed about one hour following the homicide. During same interview, Student #1 advised she/he did not know who the suspects were and she/he had not seen them before. He/She indicated that there was one suspect who approached the Victim and shot him. Student #1 further advised that he/she saw 2 others who did not approach the Victim but did appear to

⁴⁷ Chestnut, Watkins and Stewart were present at the school and were in the D unit classroom area until they were told to leave at around 12:45pm. While the Chestnut group was there, there is no dispute that they were being silly and disruptive.

⁴⁸ This timing makes it impossible for Student #4 to have seen the murder as there would not have been enough time to see the murder, then be in the cafeteria in time to see the Victim come in. The shooting occurred moments before the Victim came into the cafeteria.

⁴⁹ At the time.